

scription of appliances and their application to specific problems with no relationship to diagnosis. A useful but difficult article.

The next three articles are on advanced degenerative arthritis of the hip by four authors and the next two by a single author give a good clear and timely discussion of methods of treatment of osteoarthritis of the hip. Particularly it defined the different operations that exist and their usefulness and relationship to one another. I think for general reading this is the most useful series of articles in the volume.

The tenth article on surgical anatomy and exposure of the knee joint is too superficial to be of value.

The eleventh article is a timely discussion of osteoarthritis of the knee. It is based on the author's book on the subject and best serves as an introduction to that volume.

The last article is an excellent and exact discussion of synovial fluid analysis and is useful to all physicians dealing with patients. Next to the articles on degenerative arthritis of the hip, I would feel this is the most useful article in this volume particularly for general reading.

J. PAUL HARVEY, JR., M.D.

* * *

DEALING WITH DRUG ABUSE—A Report to the Ford Foundation— Foreword by McGeorge Bundy—The Drug Abuse Survey Project—Patricia M. Wald & Peter Barton Hutt, Co-chairmen; James V. DeLong, Executive Director; Edgar May, Annette Abrams, Peter A. Wilson, Peter B. Goldberg, John F. Holahan, Paul A. Henningsen and Andrew T. Weil, M.D. Praeger Publishers, 111 Fourth Avenue, New York City (10003), 1972. 396 pages, \$8.95.

I must confess that when I was asked to review the volume "Dealing with Drug Abuse—A Report to the Ford Foundation" my reaction was one of initial dismay, for I had already read the volume and had a number of reservations about it. However, a review for a medical journal obviates some of this reluctance. My hesitations have to do, not so much with the survey project or the staff papers themselves, for all the words are there, but rather the "music" is lacking; namely the "gut level" expertise behind the words. It is obvious that the staffers worked hard and long in interviewing people in the drug field and attended multiple drug conferences, but it is equally obvious that they have had very little grassroots experience in working with the drug abuse problem. So, while the report covers a wide range of the drug problems in many areas it misses many, if not most, of the essential ingredients for a significant contribution.

It is as though a medical student were writing a review paper for a journal or a Ph.D. were writing his thesis, each about some rather exotic, rarely-seen syndrome where a review of the literature would be necessary. However, when we talk about drug abuse, we are dealing with the third most pressing problem of concern to the American public (according to the National drug commission's recent national survey), a problem which is just behind that of Vietnam (and gaining on it) and behind the number one issue, the economy.

Thus for the practicing physician who is working with drug abusing patients, there is little here that is not contained in dozens of other volumes. For the retired physician, at home, who merely wishes philosophical discussion about heroin maintenance, altered states of consciousness, or about theories of various mechanisms of action of some of the opiates, etc., this may provide some intellectual relief. But we really are in a time of crisis and deep concern about drugs and nowhere does the volume present or pinpoint this. Perhaps the most surprising thing is that the staff report was not kept within the Ford Foundation but was released and published (as is almost any-

thing that is written about drugs today) for general distribution to the public. But this is a time when the drug problem has become politicized and is now being institutionalized and it is a time when the control/enforcement, prevention/education, and treatment/rehabilitation forces are all seeking funding and emphasizing their modalities, each as top priority items. This book sheds little light on how such priorities might accurately be ascertained.

In an analogous fashion many had hoped that when President Nixon created the new SAODAP (Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention) the drug politicization process would diminish. This office was to "tell things like they are" and if necessary "heads would roll." But unfortunately, that proved to be just another myth; even there no one dares to reveal the boondoggling, vested interests and downright incompetence which is so obvious in so many of the governmental agencies dealing with drug abuse. Even those "civilian professionals" who were selected for this office and had previously been critical and honestly outspoken have now remained curiously silent on many of the pressing drug issues of the day (for example, repeated "no comment" on the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse's recommendations made to the President and Congress this March).

Thus, many people were looking to the Ford Foundation and subsequently their privately funded drug abuse consortium that developed as a sophisticated form of (Ralph) "Nader's Raiders," who could and would "tell it like it is" and would reveal that the same problems are happening in drugs that happened in the poverty program (with the patients being disregarded, as others vie for political and financial power under the rubric of "drug abuse program"). This report alludes to all kinds of problems, but doesn't specify which ones deserve top priority, and apparently is suffering from an institutionalization process of its own. Perhaps it is necessary (for a Foundation, with a Board of Directors, who exert policy control) to "not rock the boat," especially when the group is based in Washington. Certainly this has been true for the advertising of anti-drug commercials, as lobbying groups protested certain anti-drug advertisements until the final result was a watered down, probably ineffectual product. At any rate, it looks very much from the subsequent press releases of the Ford group, as the consortium was formed, that they based their goals on this volume and that we will now have just another similar "government-type agency."

But there is a definite need for a critical evaluation of drug programs, as huge amounts of money are being wasted and there is a tragic lack of patient care and long waiting lists for urgent priority items like methadone maintenance and half-way house treatment. The tragic dichotomy between law enforcement and medicine continues, with medicine having abrogated its responsibility for treatment, with young experimenters sometimes winding up in jail while major pushers go free, and with the padding of law enforcement "felony arrest" statistics (that is, for marijuana possession) continues. But nowhere does anyone come forward to challenge this. I am pessimistic in general, and especially from this volume, that the Ford Foundation and consortium will cause anything constructive to happen in this area of most dire need. If this seems like an unduly pessimistic review of this report perhaps it is only a reflection of the reviewer's personal bias, although I must say that several other professionals with whom I have checked have had the same reaction to the volume and the initial excitement that once greeted the idea of the consortium has faded as it has yet (if ever) to even begin to approach fruition.

J. THOMAS UNGERLEIDER, M.D.